



<https://doi.org/10.53032/tvcr/2025.v7n1.35>

RESEARCH ARTICLE

## **Social Media Manipulation and the Threat to Democracy: Analyzing the Role of Disinformation**

### **Nelson Mandela**

Department of Animation & Virtual Reality,  
School of Computer Science & IT, Jain (Deemed-to-be University),  
Bangalore, Karnataka, India

### **Poovarasana G**

Department of Animation & Virtual Reality,  
School of Computer Science & IT, Jain (Deemed-to-be University),  
Bangalore, Karnataka, India

### **Suneesh KS**

Department of Animation & Virtual Reality,  
School of Computer Science & IT, Jain (Deemed-to-be University),  
Bangalore, Karnataka, India

### **Broskhan**

Department of Animation & Virtual Reality,  
School of Computer Science & IT, Jain (Deemed-to-be University),  
Bangalore, Karnataka, India

### **Abstract**

Social media is a powerful communication channel, but it's also a channel for disinformation, and that is a real threat to democracy. This article analyzes social media in the fight against fake news, exploring how they mislead the masses, influence elections, and create heated debates. A systematic literature review is a methodology to explore the process of how social media manipulation works and how it harms democracy. These studies use a mixed-methods design to study specific case studies and social media interactions to reveal how both adversaries and good users use social media to disseminate false or misleading content. Its study makes legislative recommendations on how to lessen the risk of disinformation while keeping social media open.

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

**Keywords:** Disinformation, Manipulation, Social Media, Democracy, Misleading

## **Introduction**

### **Social Media and Democracy the Function of Social Media**

Social media have made democracy much more dynamic by opening up new forms of political expression, participation and public responsibility. It makes information accessible and accessible for individuals, grassroots movements and marginalized groups in ways that could not before. Social media enables politicians to talk directly with citizens —sharing ideas quickly and giving more voice (Pennycook et al., 2021). This democratization presents challenges. Deliberate spread of propaganda, echo chambers, algorithmic curation of public opinion and targeted ad-targeting are among the many ways in which democracy can be undermined. The speed with which erroneous or false information is disseminated affects elections, increases political polarization and undermines institutional confidence. However, even so, social media is still a contradiction in terms, as an opportunity for democratic engagement but also at the risk of abuse and fragmentation (Lewandowsky & Van Der Linden, 2021).

### **Algorithms and Sensationalism: How Disinformation Works**

These are the algorithms and sensationalisms of today's ecosystem of disinformation collaborating to make the false or false news stronger. Facebook, Twitter, and all social networks have advanced algorithms that pick content that gets the most views, likes, shares, and comments, because it makes money through the increase in advertising (O'Sullivan, 2005). The downside is that headlines, and headlines that generate extreme emotion (fear, outrage, and shock) tend to be more viral. These narratives are often divisive, misleading or even invented and play on cognitive biases including confirmation bias, which makes it easy for people to believe and propagate information based on what they already know (Mrah, 2017).

It's algorithms that govern the platforms that promote such things as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., to get it in their feeds and show it off. This sets up a cycle, in which sensational news spreads and becomes more and more entrenched in public opinion, delegitimizing the old media, experts and institutions. Disinformation is a viral disease and insufficient regulation makes it possible for lies to shape public perceptions, influence politics and engender social unrest (Ghosh, 2018).

### **Techniques of Disinformation Campaigns**

Disinformation campaigns have various sophisticated tools to misrepresent citizens, weaken institutions and distort political outcomes. The most widely used strategy is to create false storylines that look reasonable from the outside, commonly promoted through forgery of news articles or photos and videos. Social media platforms share these and algorithms that favour emotional or sensational posts can send them immediately viral (Scott, 2018). A third is "astroturfing," which is the manipulation of grassroots groups to make it look like people are

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

united behind a cause or political ideology. That can be done by bots or paid people — making them amplify certain hashtags or messages to appear like grassroots.

Disinformation campaigns generally follow "divide and conquer" techniques, in which selective messages are used to take advantage of social difference due to political, ethnic or ideological difference and thereby generate more popular polarization (Levin, 2017). Deep fakes – videotapes of a person saying or doing something they did not really do – become an all-the-more perilous weapon because it produces complete fictions or things that happen, making you believe in them and question them. Even worse, outside states and politicians could employ these to corrupt elections, overthrow governments or generate domestic dissent. In the end, these techniques are designed to spin facts, create uncertainty and manipulate public opinion so that people have a harder time telling what's real from fiction (Molina et al., 2021).

## **Society's Result: Loss of Trust and Polarization**

The social consequences of disinformation are real: damage to trust and growing polarizations are two of the most enduring. As information becomes available so rapidly through digital media and not at all like a true story, traditional news outlets, specialists and institutions become suspect (Patnaik, 2021). When people hear conflicting accounts, it's hard to know who's trustworthy, so they tend to distrust authority figures – from journalists to scientists to politicians. Especially in democracies, where good decisions and democratic participation are based on mutual truths and communication, this loss of trust is most detrimental. At the same time, fake news deepens political and social division (Orlando, 2017).

When such polarising stories are deliberately used, with the intention of profiting from social mismatches, people retreat into ideological echo chambers, in which all that comes their way is support for their beliefs (Kim et al., 2018). This selective exposure feeds ideological extremism, stifling constructive debate, and making compromise ever harder. As society is fractured more widely along political and ideological lines, the less social unity it has, and the less chances of finding common ground there are. In the worst cases, this can lead to social instability, instability and diminished collective action. In the end, disinformation is rampant, creates fear, divides and undermines the sense of collective cohesiveness that a good functioning community needs (Ha et al., 2021).

## **Strategies for Addressing Disinformation**

Disinformation must be tackled with an integrated, technology-, education-, state- and social-scale approach to contain its spread and influence. Increasing digital literacy can be the most powerful weapon against disinformation because it gives people the power to do their own independent research about the content they see online. Schools can teach people to spot fake news, how to distinguish reputable sources and how algorithms synch on sensational information (Miró-Llinares & Aguerri, 2023). Moreover, social media and tech companies need to be more accountable by having more rigorous content moderation policies, using AI to identify and flag up fake content, and being more transparent about their algorithms. (Das & Bhowmick, 2020). Governments could take part by passing legislation that calls for increased

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

accountability of internet companies particularly on the display of political advertisements and the interference of foreign agents in elections.

Another strategy is to support media literacy and promote good journalism, make sure trusted news outlets are easily available and encouraged, and thus fight fake news with factual reporting. Tech companies, governments, and civil society must all work together for a collective response to disinformation (Vicario et al., 2019). What's more, building up fact-checking groups and giving users ways to validate their sources (reverse image searches or debunking websites) can also prevent misinformation spread in real time. After all, allowing freedom of speech and building cross-ideological bridges could mitigate the division that is often fueled by disinformation. With space for respectful, fact-based debate, we can attempt to bridge disinformation's divides and rebuild trust in the commons.

## **Review of Literature**

### **Disinformation and Social Media Manipulation**

The literature on disinformation and the role it plays in social media manipulation has become enormously popular in recent years, covering a wide range of issues related to elections, political divisions, public opinion and democracy in general. Various researchers have examined the unique characteristics of social media networks that make them susceptible to the spread of disinformation and the psychological and behavioral factors that allow these campaigns to work (Scheufele & Krause, 2019).

### **Social Media's Distribution of Lie Power – False Stories are overcome on Social Media**

Scientists like Tufekci (2015, 2017) and Vosoughi et al. (2018) have highlighted the power of social media to drive up fake news and sexually offensive content. According to Tufekci (2015), the structures of websites like Facebook and Twitter allow for quick disinformation spreading because they are built on algorithms that maximize user interaction. These algorithms sift for anything that provokes powerful emotional responses and which are often described as sensational or misleading. Vosoughi et al. (2018) pointing out that, in both politics and social arenas, misinformation travels faster and further than news. Falsehood spreads to such a level that public trust in information sources and democratic institutions is threatened.

### **Psychological Processes of Believe and Communicate**

Scientists have studied in great detail the psychological processes that contribute to being more inclined to take on and spread fake news. (Freelon et al., 2016) Friggeri et al. (2014) analyse how information spreads on Facebook is social, showing that users will frequently post content that aligns with their views, without checking whether it is true. (Pennycook et al., 2021) Pennycook and Rand (2018) consider the cognitive biases driving the spread of disinformation. More likely to take and distribute emotionally salient news, even if it is not true. They focus on the effects of cognitive heuristics such as fluency processing and emotional resonance on online material.

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

The scientific literature has concentrated on coordinating social media manipulation by means of bots, fake news and other non-authentic acts. (Howard & Hussain, 2013) Howard (2018) analyses the roles played by political agents and foreigners in the election hacking of social media to skew public opinion by generating and disseminating misleading or false information. (Bassil-Morozow, 2023) Bakir and McStay (2018) discuss how increasingly complicated these tactics are, from automated bots used to disseminate information, influence social discourse and increase polemical opinions. These arranged activities tend to attract certain types of people, which both make the manipulation harder to detect and makes it more effective.

## **Conflict between Free Speech and Disinformation Regulation**

### **The Disinformation Regulation /Free Speech Debate**

Even as studies of disinformation mount, scholars maintain that they find the solution complicated. One is striking a good equilibrium between fighting disinformation and respecting free speech and expression. Even if most researchers want more effective regulation of disinformation, they concede that it's not always worth it. Censorship becomes too intrusive and is likely to overthrow democracy and freedom of expression. Such scientists as Howard & Hussain (2013), Tufekci (2017), Tufekci (2015), Howard (2018) promote solutions that are focused not on control but rather openness, media literacy and user empowerment. The problem, they write, is that efforts to reduce disinformation are not anathema to democratic values of free speech.

### **Social Media Regulation: How to Solve the Puzzle?**

The literature on disinformation and social media deception is proof of the complexity of the problem and the need for full solutions. The intersection of technology, psychopathology and deliberate distortion makes clear how hard it can be to resist disinformation without undermining democratic freedoms. It's not just scientists who think striking the right balance between countering disinformation and preserving free speech will be the future of public argument in the digital age (Jenkins & Deuze, 2019).

### **Research Methodology**

We use a mixed method, qualitative content analysis and quantitative data analysis in this study. It studies disinformation campaigns like the 2024 US presidential election and the Brexit vote to see how social media is manipulated. Network modelling maps disinformation distribution on networks; user surveys measure knowledge of and contribution to disinformation. Data-driven tools measure disinformation on Twitter and Facebook.

### **Theoretical Framework**

We used Framing Theory and Agenda-setting Theory to examine how media framing shapes the public perception of political affairs and how agenda-setting strategies in disinformation campaigns are applied to orient views and public discourse. Studies on disinformation and social media engineering show just how complex the problem is and that solutions must be holistic. The interplay of technologies, psychological assumptions and deliberate contrivances shows how hard it can be to resist disinformation and still maintain

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

democratic freedoms. Researchers unanimously affirm that balancing the battle against disinformation with protecting free speech is essential for public discussion in the digital age (Jenkins & Deuze, 2019).

## **Data Analysis**

**The analysis chapter is about how disinformation is propagated on social media**

## **Algorithmic Amplification**

The role of algorithmic amplification in disinformation transmission is worth investigating in light of important recent developments such as the United State presidential election in 2024 and the Brexit referendum. Algorithms of the platforms were meant to focus on what interested the user, but in fact this algorithm also biases towards the highly sensational and divisive narratives that are going to hold users' interest, facilitating the spread of disinformation to wider audience, dissemination, and societal adoption (Valkenburg et al., 2021). Our research analyzes how disinformation campaigns employ algorithms to manipulate and fragment public opinion. Analyzing social media influence in these instances allows us to understand how deliberate tactics manipulate algorithmic amplification.

Map the spread of fake news on social media - clusters, influencers, and nodes that enable it. This network mapping shows the spreading of lies, and helps to identify accounts or posts that serve as seedbeds in diffusion. Moreover, users are also asked to answer questions regarding how they understand their own participation in spreading fake news, the perception of fact from fiction, and the influence of echo chambers (Laila Kadiwal, 2023). The combination of network science and perception is key to a complete picture of algorithmic disinformation processes, where platform design, viral content and personal responsibility are all entangled in the production of misinformation. This full-service approach can be used to inform policy and design change in the future that will reduce the harm of algorithmic amplification to democratic institutions.

## **The echo chamber and the filter bubble**

The echo chamber and the filter bubble make people susceptible to disinformation in a big way by crowding people around the same types of content and relationships. This selective distribution reinforces preexisting beliefs, keeping users from hearing alternative views and allowing disinformation to circulate. For large events – the 2024 US presidential election and the Brexit vote, for example – echo chambers make social media manipulation all the more ominous by encouraging closed networks where disinformation is free to spread.

The work uses network analysis to map the flow of disinformation in and out of these isolated networks. The data shows clusters of people who only engage with uniform content, and how echo chambers allow lies to endure unswervingly. It reveals that prominent accounts within these clusters are the largest sources of fake news (Rahman, A., & Singh, P, 2021). At the same time, questionnaires test user's knowledge about the informational space – how do filter bubbles impact their access to alternative perspectives and how they may promote false news? This article examines filter bubbles and echo chambers in spreading disinformation using network analysis and user feedback. It makes the need for policies that will promote

# *The Voice of Creative Research*

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

information plurality and limit the power of ideologically cloaked networks even more urgent. This research could be used to inform work to disrupt the cycles of feedback that foster the spread of disinformation within these self-feeding social media bubbles.

## **Bot Networks and Fake Accounts**

Bot networks and fake accounts are key components of disinformation campaigns carried out by political groups and foreign states. These organized networks enable disinformation to circulate widely among people and lead them to believe that all people support or believe certain stories. Bot networks frequently proliferate anti-democratic propaganda, shape opinions and affect political support during historic elections, such as the U.S. presidential election in 2024 or the Brexit vote. This paper uses network analysis to pinpoint bot networks and phishing accounts that spread fake news.

The data reveals the network working together to artificially grow the reach and awareness of specific stories through patterns of content consumption, activity and frequency. This analysis identifies the importance of critical "hub" accounts (sometimes bots or artificial identities) in the propagation of deceptive information through linked user networks and it exposes the methodological structure of these disinformation efforts (Giroux & McLaren, 1994). Users' surveys also look at whether users can identify a genuine user account and a bot, and whether they are aware of how an automated account might influence public discussion. It details how bots disseminate fake news using network map and perception data. It also shows how dangerous it is to spread untruths wider than they really are (Michael, 1995). These insights can inform regulatory and platform actions to flag, control and counteract bot networks and fake accounts to protect public opinion from external deception.

## **Psychological Drivers**

This paper studies the psychological drivers of disinformation diffusion, in terms both cognitive and emotional biases. These biases lead people to believe whatever is true in relation to what they already believe, and to feel strongly about emotional material — leading to false narratives. They use network analysis to uncover groups of people that are more prone to being convinced of something they believe in or make them feel emotional (Putnam, n.d.). We can also find in the user surveys users' awareness of cognitive biases and the use of emotions in online behaviour. The study suggests promoting users to be more aware of cognitive biases, emotional awareness, and media literacy to stop disinformation. The study provides practical tips for increasing resistance to manipulation and political division.

## **Findings & Discussion**

This research makes the intersection between social media, fake news and democracy all the more evident. Facebook and Twitter democratised information, shook up citizens, and brought social movement. But they've also become fronts for disinformation campaigns, which hack computational models to shape public sentiment and cloud democracy. One has only to look at the campaigns for the 2024 U.S. presidential election or the Brexit referendum to see how these campaigns widen rifts in society, create political divisiveness, and lead to distrust of institutions such as the government and the press. Network studies describe how disinformation

# The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

travels in social networks and how echo chambers and filter bubbles help propagate false information fast. Studies measure user knowledge of how they participate in this process and show that users know the source of fake news, but are not empowered to think about it objectively (Acar & Murthy, 2018). The studies suggest that the solution to disinformation must be a combination of platform interventions (automated detonators and fact-checking initiatives) and public commitment to media literacy and critical thinking.

In the face of disinformation, there are ethical and legal questions about the control of content and the protection of free speech. Governments and social media have to balance this against the right of individuals. This work reveals just how essential users can be to breaking the misinformation cycle: building a smart electorate is a key element to democratic resistance to manipulation. The more consumers become more media-literate and the more platforms adopt hygienic policies, the better we can counter disinformation with healthy, open public discourse.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to explain the dangers of disinformation on social media, which can weaken trust and mislead users. An example includes the 2024 U.S. presidential election and the Brexit vote where disinformation campaigns utilize social media to shape opinions and interfere with informed choices. According to the research, social media firms could help to address these risks by increasing algorithm transparency, fact-checking mechanisms and automating the detection of disinformation. Yet governments, civil society institutions and individual users too need to play their part in creating an environment for information resilience. This must be multi-stakeholder to maintain democracy in the digital era and provide balance between responsibility and free exchange of thought.

## References

- Acar, & Murthy. (2018). Social Media Use in the Nonprofit Sector: Exploring Organizational Communication on Facebook. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(2), 319–339. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/0899764017733807>
- Bassil-Morozow, H. (2023). *The New Heroines in Film and Television: Post-Jungian Perspectives on Contemporary Female Characters* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003253044>
- Das, S., & Bhowmick, S. (2020). Digital Empowerment through Social Media: Pathways for Poverty Alleviation. *Journal of Economic and Social Policy*, 18(2), 85–103.
- Freelon, D., McIlwain, C. D., & Clark, M. D. (2016). Beyond the Hashtags: #Ferguson, #Blacklivesmatter, and the Online Struggle for Offline Justice. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2747066>
- Ghosh, D. (2018). Disinformation Is Becoming Unstoppable. *Public Interest Technology*.
- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. Routledge.

# The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

- Ha, L., Andreu Perez, L., & Ray, R. (2021). Mapping Recent Development in Scholarship on Fake News and Misinformation, 2008 to 2017: Disciplinary Contribution, Topics, and Impact. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 65(2), 290–315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219869402>
- Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2013). *Democracy's fourth wave? Digital media and the Arab Spring*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, & Deuze. (2019). *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York University Press.
- Kim, J., Tabibian, B., Oh, A., Schölkopf, B., & Gomez-Rodriguez, M. (2018). Leveraging the Crowd to Detect and Reduce the Spread of Fake News and Misinformation. *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 324–332. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3159652.3159734>
- Laila Kadiwal. (2023). Critical feminist resistance to the politics of hate in India. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 21(5), 734–753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2222074>
- Levin, S. (2017). Facebook promised to tackle fake news. But the evidence shows it's not working. *Support the Guardian*.
- [https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/may/16/facebook-fake-news-tools-not-working?MPA\\_Daily\\_News\\_Roundup](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/may/16/facebook-fake-news-tools-not-working?MPA_Daily_News_Roundup)
- Lewandowsky, S., & Van Der Linden, S. (2021). Countering Misinformation and Fake News through Inoculation and Prebunking. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 32(2), 348–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2021.1876983>
- Michael, D. (1995). *Behind the Mule Race and Class in African-American Politics*.
- Miró-Llinares, F., & Aguerri, J. C. (2023). Misinformation about fake news: A systematic critical review of empirical studies on the phenomenon and its status as a 'threat.' *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(1), 356–374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370821994059>
- Molina, M. D., Sundar, S. S., Le, T., & Lee, D. (2021). "Fake News" Is Not Simply False Information: A Concept Explication and Taxonomy of Online Content. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 65(2), 180–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219878224>
- Mrah, I. (2017). Developing Higher Order Thinking Skills: Towards a Rethinking of EFL Coursebooks in Moroccan High Schools. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 2(3), 225. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v2i3.79>
- Orlando. (2017). *How to Help Kids Navigate Fake News and Misinformation Online*. *The Conversation*. <http://theconversation.com>
- O'Sullivan, D. (2005). *Cultural politics and Irish education since the 1950's: Policy paradigms and power*. Institute of Public Administration.
- Patnaik, N. (2021). Geographical Indications Protection In India: Case Study Analysis On 'Tirupati Laddu.' *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, 3(1).

# The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 7 & Issue 1 (January 2025)

- Pennycook, G., Binnendyk, J., Newton, C., & Rand, D. G. (2021). A Practical Guide to Doing Behavioral Research on Fake News and Misinformation. *Collabra: Psychology*, 7(1), 25293. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.25293>
- Putnam. (n.d.). *Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital*.
- Rahman, A., & Singh, P. (2021). Digital Pathways to Poverty Reduction: The Role of Social Media in Developing Economies. *International Journal of Social Media and Society*, 5(2), 102–119.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Krause, N. M. (2019). Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16), 7662–7669. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805871115>
- Scott, B. (2018). Disinformation Is Becoming Unstoppable. *The Center for Internet and Society (CIS)*. <https://cyberlaw.stanford.edu/publications/disinformation-becoming-unstoppable/>
- Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.
- Valkenburg, P. M., Pouwels, J. L., Beyens, I., Van Driel, I. I., & Keijsers, L. (2021). Adolescents' social media experiences and their self-esteem: A person-specific susceptibility perspective. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000037>
- Vicario, M. D., Quattrociocchi, W., Scala, A., & Zollo, F. (2019). Polarization and Fake News: Early Warning of Potential Misinformation Targets. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 13(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3316809>
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>